arXiv:1412.3729v1 [cs.PL] 10 Dec 2014

Non-termination of Dalvik bytecode *via* compilation to CLP

Étienne Payet and Fred Mesnard

Université de La Réunion, EA2525-LIM
Saint-Denis de La Réunion, F-97490, France
{etienne.payet,frederic.mesnard}@univ-reunion.fr

Abstract

We present a set of rules for compiling a Dalvik bytecode program into a logic program with array constraints. Non-termination of the resulting program entails that of the original one, hence the techniques we have presented before for proving non-termination of constraint logic programs can be used for proving non-termination of Dalvik programs.

1998 ACM Subject Classification D.2.4 Software/Program Verification (Formal methods), F.3.1 Specifying and Verifying and Reasoning about Programs (Mechanical verification), F.3.2 Semantics of Programming Languages (Program analysis)

Keywords and phrases Non-Termination, Android, Dalvik, Constraint Logic Programming

1 Introduction

Android is currently the most widespread operating system for mobile devices. Applications running on this system can be downloaded from anywhere, hence reliability is a major concern for its users. In this paper, we consider applications that may run into an infinite loop, which may cause a resource exhaustion, for instance the battery if the loop continuously uses a sensor as the GPS. Android programs are written in Java and compiled to the Google's Dalvik Virtual Machine (DVM) bytecode format [3] before installation on a device. We provide a set of rules for compiling a Dalvik bytecode program into a constraint logic program [5]. Non-termination of the resulting program entails that of the original one, hence the technique we have presented before [6] for proving non-termination of constraint logic programs can be used for proving non-termination of Dalvik programs. We model the memory and the objects it contains with *arrays*, so we compile Dalvik programs to logic programs with array constraints and we consider the theory of arrays presented in [1].

2 The Dalvik Virtual Machine

We briefly describe the operational semantics of the DVM (see [3] for a complete description). Unlike the JVM which is stack-based, the DVM is register-based. Each method uses its own array of registers and invoked methods do not affect the registers of invoking methods. The number of registers used by a method is statically known. At the beginning of an execution, the N arguments to a method land in its last N registers and the other registers are initialized to 0. Many Dalvik bytecode instructions are similar, so we concentrate on a restricted set which exemplifies the operations that the DVM performs.

- *const* d, c Move constant c into register d (*i.e.,* the register at index d in the array of registers of the method where this instruction occurs).
- *move* d, s Move the content of register s into register d.
- *add* d, s, c Store the sum of the content of register s and constant c into register d.

- *if-lt* i, j, q If the content of register i is less than the content of register j then jump to program point q, otherwise execute the immediately following instruction.
- *goto* q Jump to program point q.
- *invoke* S, m where $S = s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_p$ is a sequence of register indexes and m is a method. The content r^{s_0} of register s_0, ..., r^{s_p} of register s_p are the *actual parameters* of the call. Value r^{s_0} is called *receiver* of the call and must be 0 (the equivalent of `null` in Java) or a reference to an object o. In the former case, the computation stops with an exception. Otherwise, a lookup procedure is started from the class of o upwards along the superclass chain, looking for a method with the same signature as m. That method is run from a state where its last registers are bound to $r^{s_0}, r^{s_1}, \ldots, r^{s_p}$.
- *return* Return from a void method.
- *new-instance* d, κ Move a reference to a new object of class κ into register d.
- *iget* d, i, f (resp. *iput* s, i, f) The content r^i of register i must be 0 or a reference to an object o. If r^i is 0, the computation stops with an exception. Otherwise, $o(f)$ (the value of field f of o) is stored into register d (resp. the content of register s is stored into $o(f)$).

3 Compilation to CLP clauses

We model a *memory* as a pair (a, i) where a is an array of *objects* and i is the index into this array where the next insertion will take place. An *object* o is an array of terms of the form $[w, f_1(v_1), \ldots, f_n(v_n)]$ where w is the name of the class of o, f_1, ..., f_n are the names of the fields defined in this class and v_1, ..., v_n are the current values of these fields in o. So, the first component of a memory is an array of arrays of terms and a memory location is an index into this array. Memory locations start at 1 and 0 corresponds to the `null` value.

Our compilation rules are given in Fig. 1–3. We associate a predicate symbol p_q to each program point q of the Dalvik program P under consideration. We generate clauses with constraints on integer and array terms. Our constraint theory combines the theory of integers with that of arrays defined in [1]. Our CLP domain of computation $\mathcal{D}$ (values interpreting constraints) is the union of $\mathbb{Z}$ with the set Obj of arrays of terms of the form $f(i)$ where i is an integer and with the set of arrays of elements of Obj. The read $a[i]$ returns the value stored at position i of the array a and the write $a\{i \leftarrow e\}$ is a modified so that position i has value e. For multidimensional arrays, we abbreviate $a[i] \cdots [j]$ with $a[i, \ldots, j]$.

Each rule considers an instruction *ins* occurring at a program point q. We let $\tilde{V} = V_0, \ldots, V_{r-1}$ and $\tilde{V'} = V'_0, \ldots, V'_{r-1}$ be sequences of distinct variables where r is the number of registers used by the method where *ins* occurs. For each $i \in [0, r-1]$, variable V_i (resp. V'_i) models the content of register i before (resp. after) executing *ins*. We let M denote the input memory and M' the output memory. So, $\tilde{V}$ and M (or $[A, I]$) in the head of the clauses are input parameters while M' is an output parameter. We let id denote the sequence $(V'_0 = V_0, \ldots, V'_{r-1} = V_{r-1})$ and id_{-i} (where $i \in [0, r-1]$) the sequence $(V'_0 = V_0, \ldots, V'_{i-1} = V_{i-1}, V'_{i+1} = V_{i+1} \ldots, V'_{r-1} = V_{r-1})$. By $|\tilde{X}|$ we mean the length of sequence $\tilde{X}$. For any method m, q_m is the program point where m starts, $reg(m)$ is the number of registers used by m and $sign(m)$ is the set of all the methods with the same signature as m.

Some compilation rules are rather straightforward. For instance, *const* d, c moves constant c into register d, so in Fig. 1 the output register variable V'_d is set to c while the other register variables remain unchanged (modelled with id_{-d}). Rules for *move*, *add* and *goto* are similar. In Fig. 2, we consider method calls. The instruction *invoke* $s_0, \ldots, s_p, m$ is compiled into a set of clauses (one for each method with the same signature as m) which

$$\frac{\mathit{const}\ d, c}{p_q(\tilde{V}, M, M') \leftarrow \{V'_d = c\} \cup id_{-d},\ p_{q+1}(\tilde{V}', M, M')} \tag{1a}$$

$$\frac{\mathit{if\text{-}lt}\ i, j, q'}{\begin{array}{l}\{\quad p_q(\tilde{V}, M, M') \leftarrow \{V_i < V_j\} \cup id,\ p_{q'}(\tilde{V}', M, M'),\\ \quad\ p_q(\tilde{V}, M, M') \leftarrow \{V_i \geq V_j\} \cup id,\ p_{q+1}(\tilde{V}', M, M') \quad\}\end{array}} \tag{1b}$$

Figure 1 Compilation of some simple Dalvik instructions.

$$\frac{\mathit{invoke}\ s_0, \ldots, s_p, m}{\left\{\begin{array}{l|l} p_q(\tilde{V}, M, M') \leftarrow \{V_{s_0} > 0\} \cup id, & m' \in \mathit{sign}(m)\\ \qquad\qquad \mathit{lookup}_P(M, V_{s_0}, m, q_{m'}), & \text{and } \tilde{X}_{m'} = 0, \ldots, 0, V_{s_0}, \ldots, V_{s_p}\\ \qquad\qquad p_{q_{m'}}(\tilde{X}_{m'}, M, M_1), & \text{with } |\tilde{X}_{m'}| = \mathit{reg}(m')\\ \qquad\qquad p_{q+1}(\tilde{V}', M_1, M') & \end{array}\right\}} \tag{2a}$$

$$\frac{\mathit{return}}{p_q(\tilde{V}, M, M') \leftarrow \{M' = M\}} \tag{2b}$$

Figure 2 Compilation of some Dalvik instructions related to method calls.

impose that V_{s_0} (the receiver of the call) is a non-`null` location (*i.e.,* $V_{s_0} > 0$). Therefore, if $V_{s_0} \leq 0$, the execution of the generated CLP program fails, as the original Dalvik program. If $V_{s_0} > 0$, the lookup procedure begins. For each $m' \in \mathit{sign}(m)$, this is modelled with the call $\mathit{lookup}_P(M, V_{s_0}, m, q_{m'})$ which starts from the class of the object at location V_{s_0} in memory M and searches for the closest method m'' with the same signature as m upwards along the superclass chain. If $m'' = m'$, this call succeeds, otherwise it fails. Then, m' is executed, modelled with $p_{q_{m'}}(\tilde{X}_{m'}, M, M_1)$, with some registers $\tilde{X}_{m'}$ initialized as expected. When the execution of m' has finished, control jumps to the following instruction (*i.e.,* $p_{q+1}(\tilde{V}', M_1, M')$). In Fig. 3, we consider some memory-related instructions that we compile to clauses with array constraints.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\mathit{new\text{-}instance}\ d, \kappa\\ w \text{ is the name of class } \kappa \text{ and } f_1, \ldots, f_n \text{ are the names of the fields defined in } \kappa\end{array}}{\begin{array}{l}p_q(\tilde{V}, [A, I], M') \leftarrow \big\{O[0] = w,\ O[1] = f_1(0),\ \ldots,\ O[n] = f_n(0),\\ \qquad A_1 = A\{I \leftarrow O\},\ V'_d = I,\ I_1 = I + 1\big\} \cup id_{-d},\ p_{q+1}(\tilde{V}', [A_1, I_1], M')\end{array}} \tag{3a}$$

$$\frac{\mathit{iget}\ d, i, f}{p_q(\tilde{V}, [A, I], M') \leftarrow \big\{V_i > 0,\ A[V_i, F] = f(V'_d)\big\} \cup id_{-d},\ p_{q+1}(\tilde{V}', [A, I], M')} \tag{3b}$$

$$\frac{\mathit{iput}\ s, i, f}{\begin{array}{l}p_q(\tilde{V}, [A, I], M') \leftarrow \big\{V_i > 0,\ O = A[V_i],\ O[F] = f(X),\ O_1 = O\{F \leftarrow f(V_s)\},\\ \qquad A_1 = A\{V_i \leftarrow O_1\}\big\} \cup id,\ p_{q+1}(\tilde{V}', [A_1, I], M')\end{array}} \tag{3c}$$

Figure 3 Compilation of some memory-related instructions.

```
public class Loops {
  int i;
  public void m(int n, Loops x) {
    while (this.i < n) {
      this.i++;
      x.i--;
    }
  }
}
```

```
.method public m(ILoops)V
    .registers 4
0:  iget v0, v1, Loops->i:I
1:  if-lt v0, v2, 3
2:  return-void
3:  iget v0, v1, Loops->i:I
4:  add-int/lit8 v0, v0, 0x1
5:  iput v0, v1, Loops->i:I
6:  iget v0, v3, Loops->i:I
7:  add-int/lit8 v0, v0, -0x1
8:  iput v0, v3, Loops->i:I
9:  goto 0
.end method
```

```
public class MyActivity extends Activity {
  ...
  public void loop(View v) {
    Loops o1 = new Loops();
    Loops o2 = o1;
    o1.m(2, o2);
  }
  ...
}
```

```
.method public loop(Landroid/view/View;)V
    .registers 5
10:  new-instance v0, Loops
11:  invoke-direct {v0}, Loops-><init>()V
12:  move-object v1, v0
13:  const/16 v2, 0x2
14:  invoke-virtual {v0, v2, v1}, Loops->m(ILoops)V
15:  return-void
.end method
```

Figure 4 The non-terminating method `loop` is called when the user taps a button.

▶ **Theorem 1.** *Let P be a Dalvik bytecode program and P_{CLP} its CLP compilation. If there is a computation $p_{q_0}p_{q_1}\ldots$ in P_{CLP} then there is an execution $q_0q_1\ldots$ of P.*

More precisely, if there is a finite (resp. infinite) computation in P_{CLP} starting from a query $p_{q_0}(\tilde{v}, [a, i], M')$ (where $\tilde{v}$, a and i are values in $\mathcal{D}$ and M' is an output variable), then there is a finite (resp. infinite) execution of P, using the same program points, starting from values corresponding to $\tilde{v}$ and a in the DVM registers and memory.

4 Non-termination inference

The following proposition is a CLP reformulation of a result presented in [4].

▶ **Proposition 2.** *Let $r = p(\tilde{x}) \leftarrow c, p(\tilde{y})$ and $r' = p'(\tilde{x}') \leftarrow c', p(\tilde{y}')$ be some clauses. Suppose there exists a set $\mathcal{G}$ such that formulæ $\left[\forall\tilde{x}\exists\tilde{y}\ \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow (c \wedge \tilde{y} \in \mathcal{G})\right]$ and $\left[\exists\tilde{x}'\exists\tilde{y}'\ c' \wedge \tilde{y}' \in \mathcal{G}\right]$ are true. Then, p' has an infinite computation in $\{r, r'\}$.*

Consider the Android program in Fig. 4, with the Java syntax on the left and the corresponding Dalvik bytecode P on the right, where `v0`, `v1`, ... denote registers 0, 1, ... Method `loop` in class `MyActivity` is called when the user taps a button displayed by the application. Execution of this method does not terminate because in the call to `m`, the objects `o1` and `o2` are aliased and therefore by decrementing `x.i` we are also decrementing `this.i` in the loop of method `m`. We get the following clauses for program points 0 and 14:

$$p_0(\tilde{V}, [A, I], M') \leftarrow \{A[V_1, F] = i(V_0')\} \cup id_{-0},\ p_1(\tilde{V}', [A, I], M')$$

$$p_{14}(\tilde{V}, M, M') \leftarrow \{V_0 > 0\} \cup id,\ lookup_P(M, V_0, \texttt{Loops->m(ILoops)V}, 0),\ p_0(0, V_0, V_2, V_1, M, M_1),\ p_{15}(\tilde{V}', M_1, M')$$

Let P_{CLP} denote the CLP program resulting from the compilation of P. The set of *binary unfoldings* [2] of P_{CLP} contains the following clauses

$$\begin{aligned} r: \quad & p_0(\tilde{V}, [A, I], M') \leftarrow \{V_1 > 0,\ O = A[V_1],\ O[F] = i(X),\ X < V_2, \\ & O_1 = O\{F \leftarrow i(X+1)\},\ A_1 = A\{V_1 \leftarrow O_1\}, \\ & V_3 > 0,\ O' = A_1[V_3],\ O'[F'] = i(X'),\ V_0' = X' - 1, \\ & O_1' = O'\{F' \leftarrow i(V_0')\},\ A_2 = A_1\{V_3 \leftarrow O_1'\}\} \cup id_{-0},\ p_0(\tilde{V}', [A_2, I], M') \\ r': \quad & p_{10}(\tilde{V}, [A, I], M') \leftarrow \{O[0] = \mathit{loops},\ O[1] = i(0),\ A_1 = A\{I \leftarrow O\}, \\ & I_1 = I + 1,\ I > 0\},\ p_0(0, I, 2, I, [A_1, I_1], M_1) \end{aligned}$$

where r corresponds to the path $0 \to 1 \to 3 \to 4 \to \cdots \to 9 \to 0$ and r' to the path $10 \to 11 \to 12 \to 13 \to 14 \to 0$ in P. In r', O corresponds to both o_1 and o_2, which expresses that o_1 and o_2 are aliased. Note that I, the address of O, is passed to p_0 both as second and fourth parameter, which corresponds in r to V_1 (`this` in method `m`) and V_3 (`x` in `m`). Moreover, when $V_1 = V_3$ in r, we have $O' = O_1$, $F' = F$ and $X' = X + 1$, hence $V_0' = X' - 1 = X$. Therefore, we have $O_1' = O$, so $A_2 = A$. The logical formulæ of Proposition 2 are true for the set $\mathcal{G} = \{(\tilde{v}, mem, mem') \in \mathcal{D}^3 | v_1 = v_3\}$. Hence, p_{10} has an infinite computation in $\{r, r'\}$, which implies [2] that p_{10} has an infinite computation in P_{CLP}. So by Theorem 1, P has an infinite execution from program point 10.

5 Future Work

We plan to implement the technique described above and to write a solver for array constraints. Currently, our compilation rules only consider the operational semantics of Dalvik, a part of the Android platform. We also plan to extend them by considering the operational semantics of other components of Android, for instance *activities* that we have studied in [7].

References

1 A. R. Bradley, Z. Manna, and H. B. Sipma. What's decidable about arrays? In E. A. Emerson and K. S. Namjoshi, editors, *Proc. of VMCAI'06*, volume 3855 of *LNCS*, pages 427–442. Springer, 2006.

2 M. Codish and C. Taboch. A semantic basis for the termination analysis of logic programs. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 41(1):103–123, 1999.

3 Dalvik docs mirror. `http://www.milk.com/kodebase/dalvik-docs-mirror/`.

4 A. Gupta, T. A. Henzinger, R. Majumdar, A. Rybalchenko, and R.-G. Xu. Proving non-termination. In G. C. Necula and P. Wadler, editors, *Proc. of POPL'08*, pages 147–158. ACM Press, 2008.

5 J. Jaffar, M. J. Maher, K. Marriott, and P. J. Stuckey. The semantics of constraint logic programs. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 37(1-3):1–46, 1998.

6 É. Payet and F. Mesnard. A non-termination criterion for binary constraint logic programs. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 9(2):145–164, 2009.

7 É. Payet and F. Spoto. An operational semantics for Android activities. In W.-N. Chin and J. Hage, editors, *Proc. of PEPM'14*, pages 121–132. ACM, 2014.